

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-9, 13-16, 18, 19, 22, 25, 28, 32, 34 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,321,231 to Jebens et al. No claims have been amended, cancelled, or added. Claims , 2, 4-9, 13-16, 18, 19, 22, 25, 28, 32, 34 and 35 and 37-54 remain pending.

Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jebens in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,701,302 to Schaeffer et al. Examiner rejected claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jebens in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0158874 to Cao.

The Examiner found claims 37-54 allowable. Claims 10, 17, 20, 21, 24, 26, 27, 29-31, 33 and 36 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for his careful examination, and for finding these claims allowable.

Response to §102 rejections

Claim 1 recites “transferring lower-resolution copies of the digital images **to the central server** using relatively-low bandwidth communication, and subsequently transferring higher-resolution copies of the digital images **to the central server** using relatively-high bandwidth communication.”

In order to show the above-mentioned features, the Office action relies on the following text in Jebens:

Advantageously, the low-resolution images downloaded to the agency preferably have a relatively low bandwidth communication requirement and can

be transmitted in a relatively short amount of time. Such images are also far less taxing on the computer resources of the agency during the creation of the brochure than high resolution copies of those same images. After the images are stored on the system, high resolution versions of the images, with their relatively high bandwidth communication requirements and relatively long transmission times, are preferably only downloaded when required; such as when printing or otherwise publishing a finalized product incorporating such images.

Jebens, 5: 23-35.

As is demonstrated in the passage above, the low-resolution images in Jebens are downloaded *to the agency*, and the high resolution versions of the images are downloaded when printing or otherwise publishing a finalized product incorporating such images is required. Jebens also discloses that the document with high resolution versions of the images is downloaded not to the agency, but to a publishing entity such as a printer (Jebens, 5: 11-23). Thus, Jebens does not teach or suggest transferring high resolution copies of the image and low resolution copies of the image to the same location (i.e. the central server). Rather, Jebens transfers low resolution images to an advertising agency, while high resolution images are transferred to the printer. Therefore, claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable in view of Jebens and should be allowed.

Response to §103 rejections

Schaeffer concerns a method for managing a quick distribution of images. (Schaeffer, Abstract.) Claim 3 recites the features of “transferring lower-resolution copies of the digital images **to the central server** using relatively-low bandwidth communication, and subsequently transferring higher-resolution copies of the digital images **to the central server** using relatively-high bandwidth communication” by virtue of its being dependent on claim 1. Schaeffer does not address such a two-stage

transfer. Therefore, Schaeffer, whether considered separately or in combination with Jebens, fails to disclose or suggest these features. Therefore, claim 3 is patentable and should be allowed for at least the reasons articulated with respect to claim 1.

Cao discloses a data structure, termed a pyramid, representing levels of data. (Cao, Abstract.) Claims 11 and 12 recite features of “transferring lower-resolution copies of the digital images **to the central server** using relatively-low bandwidth communication, and subsequently transferring higher-resolution copies of the digital images **to the central server** using relatively-high bandwidth communication” by virtue of their being dependent on claim 1. Cao does not teach or suggest such a two-stage transfer. Therefore, Cao, whether considered separately or in combination with Jebens and Schaeffer, fails to disclose or suggest these features. Therefore, claims 11 and 12 are patentable and should be allowed for at least the reasons articulated with respect to claim 1.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the amendments and discussion set forth herein, the applicable rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, the present and amended claims should be found to be in condition for allowance.

If a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Elena Dreszer at (408) 947-8200.

If there are any additional charges/credits, please charge/credit our deposit account no. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 9-19-05



Elena B. Dreszer
Reg. No. 55,128

Customer No. 08791
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(408) 947-8200